DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 173 CE 020 349

TITLE	Project CELIT (Career Education Leadership Interaction Teams).
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	30 Sep 78
GRANT	G0077C0063
NOTE	57p.; For related documents see ED 132 284 and ED 138 786
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Education; Career Exploration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership Training; *Program Planning; *School Community Cooperation; Team Training; Volunteers; Work Experience; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	Education Amendments 1976; Project CELIT

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to increase successful career education collaborative programming in elementary and secondary schools, representatives of several university counselor education programs planned and then implemented a training program for small teams. The ten teams chosen, all volunteers and consisting of business and government representatives and school staffs, each attended a team workshop and then proceeded to hold weekly team meetings. Each team used the meetings to plan collaborative community-school efforts and to learn by doing as they developed career education activities and programming such as field trips, work experiences, and classroom presentations. Four of the original ten teams continued providing leadership after the end of the first year. Project CELIT (Career Education Leadership Interaction Teams) demonstrated that persons in leadership positions can be trained to plan, implement, and evaluate collaborative career education programs, and that a significant number of them will retain strong commitment to programs of benefit to local youth. (CP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181173

CE020349

CONTRACT NO. G0077C0063

PROJECT CELIT
(CAREER EDUCATION LEADERSHIP INTERACTION TEAMS)

Donald R. Rye
Project Director

University of Arkansas
Counselor Education Program
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

September 30, 1978

Prepared For

Office of Education
Career Education Program
Grant and Procurement Management Division
Washington, D.C. 20202

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROJECT STAFF

Dr. Donald Rye, Project Director
University of Arkansas

Mr. Larry Baker, Administrative Assistant
University of Arkansas
Author of Final Performance Report
Mr. Ken Coon, Project Coordinator and Coordinator
University of Central Arkansas Unit

Dr. Claude Caffey, Coordinator
Henderson State University Unit

Dr. Jim Golden, Coordinator
Arkansas State University Unit

Dr. Paul Kirkpatrick, Coordinator
Southern Arkansas University

Dr. Elizabeth Shipman, Internal Evaluator
Southern Arkansas University

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Volume I Performance Report

The Story of CELIT 1

Formulation Planning and Writing 1
Basic Assumptions of The Model 1
Selection of Communities and Teams 2
Site Characteristics and Success 2
Participants are Volunteers 3
Training by Doing 3
Evidence of Institutionalization 5
Pre-Service Training 6
Evaluation 6
Summary 6
Steps in Establishing a CELIT 7

CELIT's Goals, Objectives, and Activities 7

Primary Goals 8
Objectives 8
Pre-training Objectives 9
Proposed Activities 9
Seminar Activities 10

Activities Accomplished 12

Project-Wide Activities 15
Site Activities - Common 17
Site Activities - Specific 18

Dissemination 20

Special Activities 23

Evaluation 26

Analysis of Data 29
Visual Inspection 29
Interrater Reliability Estimate 31
Percent Report 32
Statistical Analysis t tests 32
Statistical Analysis Using Multiple Regression 35

Summary of Self-Evaluation 39

Conclusion 40

Appendixes

Third Party Evaluator Final Report

Volume II - Supporting Documents

Volume III- Team Plans

List of Tables

Table I 33

A Comparison of Each CELIT's Pre-Test/Post-Test Results for Each Specific Learner Outcome Category

Table II 34

Percent of CELIT's Members at Each Location Reaching a "USE" Level in a Specified Learner Outcome Category

Table III 36

Multiple Correlation and Regression Results Using Post-Test as the Criterion Variable and Pre-Test, University and Site as the Predictors

Table IV 36

Multiple Correlation and Regression Results Using Post-Test as the Criterion Variable and Pre-Test, University and Site as the Predictors

Table V 37

Multiple Correlation and Regression Results Using Gain Scores as the Criterion Variable and Pre-Test, University and Site as the Predictors

Table VI 37

Multiple Correlation and Regression Results Using Gain Scores as the Criterion Variable and Pre-Test, University and Site as the Predictors

The CELIT Story
(Career Education Leadership Interaction Teams)

The Story of CELIT
(Career Education Leadership Interaction Teams)

Formulation Planning and Writing

The CELIT Story had its beginnings in 1976 during discussions on career education held by the Arkansas Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (AACES). A willingness to increase state-wide cooperation and a strong interest in the role of the community led to a decision to develop a career education proposal. Faculty representatives from all five University counselor education programs in Arkansas agreed that a central issue for successful career education programming must include a strong school/community collaborative effort.

The Project Director proceeded to develop a specific concept which was subsequently presented to and endorsed by the AACES group. Individuals from each of the five universities volunteered to participate in a three month planning and writing process. The state supervisor for career education was consulted and he participated throughout the planning and writing of the proposal.

The proposal writing process provided several benefits for the participants which were later important to the success of the project. In short, the mutuality experienced during the project planning and writing became an experience in collaboration for the individuals and the universities involved.

Basic Assumptions of the Model

The CELIT model is based on the following assumptions:

1. Local school/community leaders can be trained to plan, implement, and evaluate career education programs.
2. Local school/community leaders are the most potent change agents available for installing ongoing and viable innovations in career education at the local level.
3. Local school/community leaders will develop and retain a strong commitment to programs which are perceived as being of benefit to the youth in their community.

4. Local school/community leaders will commit themselves to programs which increase the potential of the community to hold those youth who might otherwise move away.

Selection of Communities and Team Members

Project CELIT began on July 1, 1977. Immediately after notification of funding, the process of selecting target schools and communities was initiated. Each university selected two school/community sites within driving distance of its campus in accordance with the criteria established by the proposal. A documented commitment from each school system was required. This usually took the form of a letter from the superintendent stating interest in and support for the project. Each university selected one small (K-12 enrollment of 750 or less) and one large (K-12 enrollment of 1500 or more) school/community unit. Upon selection of target communities, identification of school and community leadership was initiated. The intent in selecting school and community leaders was to identify those persons most influential in making decisions and in conducting programs which benefit the community. Each team was to include persons in business, labor, government, and industry from the community as well as administrators, counselors and teachers in K-12 from the school. Selecting communities and team members was a critical process in the success of the project. Finding community leaders who demonstrated a high level of commitment to and involvement with community-oriented programs coupled with a strong working relationship with the local school system was critically important to the outcomes desired.

Site Characteristics and Success

The characteristics of schools/communities selected were widely varied in size, economic base, racial composition, and geographic location. No patterns were found in regard to these objective variables which related to success. Large

and small, rich and poor, delta and mountain, and black and white majorities experienced some success and lack of success.

Sites which were relatively unsuccessful seemed most often to be those which had a history of problems in the school, i.e., high teacher/administrator turnover rate, as well as a lack of coherent community pride as demonstrated through various community improvement projects. In the most obvious instance, school and community persons would not attend the same orientation meeting, and subsequent meetings included new representatives. Despite the staff's best efforts, this team took very little action in its own behalf and accomplished little in the way of lasting efforts. The evaluation results show clearly that little improvement occurred from the pre-test to the post-test.

Participants are Volunteers

It is important to note that the project provided no monetary support for team members nor for school systems. All persons serving on teams were volunteers. Smaller communities seemed to have proportionally fewer persons who displayed a strong sense of civic responsibility. Smaller school systems seemed to have only two or three key persons doing everything that was done above a particular job assignment. The fact that all team members gave time was a definite strength of the project since any commitments developed within individuals would continue solely on their own interests,training and experiences as part of the project. Therefore, effective collaborative efforts can continue now that the project is over without the excuse "we can't do that now because our money is gone."

Training by Doing

Training for planning was carried out through a locally based experiential process consisting of two major elements. First, each university conducted a team workshop for its teams early in the planning phase. This workshop was

designed to introduce career education concepts, define collaboration, and insure that team members were acquainted with each other prior to the beginning of weekly team meetings. Second, weekly team meetings were held for the purpose of designing a locally based plan for collaboration. This training by doing process lasted four months and resulted in written plans for conducting collaborative efforts. Collaboration was involved in the planning process since representatives of the school and community were doing the planning while making decisions about needs, resources and limitations. Training for implementation was also accomplished by doing. Teams implemented their plans over a four month period following the planning phase. Since carrying out the plans required coordination, team meetings continued throughout the implementation phase. Effectiveness of implementation varied as did effectiveness in planning. However, implementation rested more closely on effective planning and consequently implementation was more often fragmented. Implementation seemed weakest in terms of involving other members of the school staffs in in-service and infusion but strongest in involving community representatives in classrooms, field trips, shadowing, and work experiences. In general, communities seemed more willing to contribute time and resources than educators were willing to utilize the communities' resources.

Evaluation of plan effectiveness was a training by doing process. Each team evaluated the practicability and meaningfulness of activities and assessed the interests of students and staff as activities were conducted. Questionnaires and self-reports were most often used to gather subjective information from participants in the various activities. A more objective measure of effectiveness can be seen in the variety and number of programs which were designed during the year and revised for continuation next year. In addition, many new efforts are presently in motion for the '78-'79 school year in local schools as well as in the universities.

Evidence of Institutionalization

CELIT teams have agreed, out of their own recognition of the need, to continue providing leadership in four of ten sites. In some instances this continuation has taken the form of establishing a rotating team membership to broaden involvement and insure continuity. In other instances a new committee will function as an Advisory Council. In-service for faculty, work experiences, Educators in Industry, and career days for middle-school students are a few of those specific activities currently planned for the coming fall semester. Two school systems are seeking funds to hire a career education coordinator who will assist in maintaining the community collaborative effort. Three schools in Project CELIT received mini-grants from the State Department Office of Career Education to assist in carrying out some dimension of next year's program. (See Appendix D).

One school paid the expenses of their high school principal to visit a rural Career Education Project in Ogden, Utah. This school system plans to adopt the rural model. An adaptation of the EBCE model will continue in a small rural school through unpaid work experience for high school students one day per week. The above mentioned activities which have been planned for next year in the local school systems offer evidence that Project CELIT did indeed achieve success after only one year in training local teams for installing collaborative Career Education efforts.

The participating universities have realized some continuing change as a result of Project CELIT. Four courses have been designed and approved at three of the five sponsoring universities. Courses titled Career Education, Career Education for the Handicapped, Coordinating Career Education, and a seminar in Career Education have been included in the 78-79 graduate and undergraduate offerings. (See Appendix D) In addition, each university has offered its

services to the schools and communities in its region for the purpose of initiating the CELIT model.

Pre-Service Training

Pre-service training for 15 graduate assistants was an outgrowth of the project. Graduate Assistants were closely involved in facilitating the planning, implementation, and evaluation phases of the project. They became familiar with Career Education literature and were indispensable as resource contacts with teams throughout the project. The experience and training obtained while a part of the project evaluation process will be available to other school/community systems upon completion of their graduate programs. The project made no attempt to evaluate the effects of training on graduate assistants as this was not a primary objective.

Evaluation

The evaluation design was a pre-post test design. The Level of Use (LoU) scale for measuring behavioral changes resulting from team member participation in the project was used. The LoU is an individual structured interview which probes participant behavior at seven levels and across seven categories. Results of statistical analysis indicate significant increased use in all categories for nine of ten teams.

Summary

Project CELIT demonstrated in ten schools and their communities that persons in school/community leadership positions can be trained to plan, implement, and evaluate collaborative career education programs. The project further demonstrated that locally planned and controlled efforts can result in meaningful institutionalization of collaborative effort after only one year of outside university intervention.

CELIT's Goals, Objectives and Activities

Steps in Establishing a CELIT

Project CELIT has demonstrated an effective process by which a university may extend its service function in Career Education beyond the usual formal communication channels of education.

The following steps have been identified as a result of Project CELIT as appropriate and effective in establishing a CELIT model program in any community.

Step 1 Identify 10-15 leaders from the school system and 10-15 leaders from the Business/Labor/Industry/Government segments of the community.

Step 2 Invite those persons identified as leader/decision-makers to an organizational meeting to discuss the possibility of school-community collaboration in Career Education efforts.

Step 3 Obtain commitments for participation from 12-15 persons attending the organizational meeting. (Ideal group will have an equal number of members from the school as from BLIG)

Step 4 Arrange and conduct In-service Training with CELIT. (See listing of resource persons for assistance)

Step 5 Establish regular CELIT meetings for planning and developing a comprehensive career education effort. (The outcome will be the CELIT plan)

Step 6 Compile, publish, and distribute the completed CELIT plan.

Step 7 Implement the CELIT plan.

Step 8 Evaluate the effectiveness of the various career education programs implemented under the CELIT plan.

Step 9 Revise the plan and arrange for the continuation of implementation efforts.

Step 10 Continue CELIT meetings as needed.

CELIT's GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTIVITIES

Before proceeding with the more technical sections of this report, a general overview of the project's goals, objectives, and proposed activities as stated in the revised proposal will be presented.

The purpose of Project CELIT was to train ten twelve-member teams through a statewide consortium effort of five Arkansas universities. The teams consisted of business/labor/industry/professional/government representatives and school personnel representing administration, instruction and counseling from the elementary,

middle, and high school levels. The purpose of their training was to install collaborative "world of school/world of work" interactions and thus increase the number and kinds of these interactions.

Primary Goals

1. In order to fulfill the purpose of this project, three primary goals were identified:

   1.0 Each team will be trained to develop a local community plan for installing collaborative career education activities.

   1.1 Each team will be trained to implement a locally developed community career education plan.

   1.2 Each team will be trained to evaluate a CELIT implemented community career education plan.

Objectives

2. Seven objectives were developed to actuate the three primary project goals:

   Under goal #1, by the end of the project year:

   2.1a All career education leadership interaction team members will increase their level of knowledge of career education as measured by the "level of use scale" to no less than a "use" level as defined by that scale.

   2.1b All CELIT members will increase their level of acquiring career education information as measured by the "level of use scale" to no less than a "use" level as defined by that scale.

   2.1c All CELIT members will increase their level of planning career education activities as measured by the "level of use scale" to no less than a "use" level as defined by that scale.

   Under goal #2, by the end of the project year:

   2.2a All CELIT members will increase their level of sharing career education ideas, concepts, plans, etc. as measured by the "level of use scale" to no less than a "use" level as defined by that scale.

   2.2b All CELIT members will increase their level of performing career education activities as measured by the "level of use scale" to no less than a "use" level as defined by that scale.

   Under goal #3, by the end of the project year:

   2.3a All CELIT members will increase their level of status reporting of their involvement with career education as measured by the "level of use scale" to no less than a "use" level as defined by that scale.

2.3b All CELIT members will increase their level of assessing career education activities as measured by the "level of use scale" to no less than a "use" level as defined by that scale.

3. Pre-training Objectives

3.0 By July 15, 1977 the counselor educators will hold a mini-conference (two-day workshop) to finalize plans for implementing the project plan.

3.1 By July 22, 1977 project staff will identify and select five large (1500+) and five small (750-) school systems.

3.2 By July 29, 1977 project staff and school systems will select team members.

4. Proposed Activities for Meeting the Objectives

4.0 CELIT members will engage in the learning activities necessary for the development of:

a. Career information systems
b. Lists of community resources
c. Community advisory systems
d. Special programs for women, minorities, and the handicapped
e. Evaluation systems to measure effect of team efforts
f. School staff for promoting more effective use of community resources

4.1 CELIT members will engage in learning activities which result in an increased understanding of the basic concepts of career education with more specific understandings of:

a. Career awareness
b. Career exploration
c. Career preparation

4.2 CELIT members will engage in learning activities designed to increase knowledge in seven basic ways that schools seek the collaborative efforts of business, labor, industrial, and governmental communities. These include such things as:

Serving the resource persons in classrooms at all levels of education to help students know and appreciate relationships between education and particular kinds of work.

Provide observational work experience and work study to students, teachers, counselors, and administrators.

Provide expert knowledge and consultation to educators concerning the nature of work, the changing nature of occupations, learning opportunities in the business, labor, industrial, governmental (BLIG) community and basic principles of the free enterprise system and the organized labor movement.

Planning collaborative assistance to education personnel in attempts to help school leavers, at any level of education, make a successful transition from school to work.

Providing effective ways for humanizing the work environment so that work, in the world of paid employment, can become more meaningful and more satisfying to individual workers.

Encouraging educators and educational systems to change in ways consistent with the career education concepts.

Working with educators who with both youth and adult students are trying to provide skills that will help persons make more productive use of leisure time.

4.3 CELIT members will develop a tentative plan for creating interaction between the "world of school" and the "world of work" for individual communities. This plan will include plans for developing such components as:

A needs and attitude assessment
Career information systems
List of Community resources
Community advisory council
Special programs for women, minorities, and handicapped
Evaluation system for measuring plan effectiveness
Observational experiences (shadowing)
Field trips
Paid and unpaid internships
Paid and unpaid work experiences
Work experiences for school staff members in BLIG community
Job placement (full or part-time)
Use of community resource persons

5. Seminar Activities

5.0 Through collaborative efforts CELIT members will develop and include in the final plan provisions for determining such career education concerns as:

How community resource persons are to be identified for the classroom?

What procedures will be utilized for contacting community resource persons?

Who arranges for field trips for student and faculty?

What emphasis should be placed on paid, as opposed to unpaid, work experiences for students?

Who evaluated the effectiveness of resource persons in the classroom? How are such evaluations to be carried out?

Who evaluated the effectiveness of student field trips into the community? Who conducts such evaluations?

How should interested community agencies and organizations contact school officials with respect to career education related activities?

Under what arrangements should summer work experience opportunities for faculty members be arranged?

5.1 CELIT members will complete final plans for developing, implementing, and evaluating career education activities calling for collaborative efforts. These include such components as:

Identification of community resource persons.

Conducting career education experiences for students in classrooms.

Providing observational experiences for students in the business, labor, industry, and governmental community.

Providing career exploration experiences for students in the community.

Providing paid experiences for students.

Providing part-time and full-time job placement programs for students.

Providing unpaid work experiences for students related to productive use of leisure time.

Providing work experience opportunities (paid and/or unpaid) for staff persons in education within the business, labor, industry, and governmental communities.

5.2 Sponsoring university faculties will meet with CELIT once a week and provide consultative services and conduct follow-up activities during the writing of the master plan.

5.3 Sponsoring university faculties will provide consultative assistance to CELIT during the implementation and evaluation of the master plan.

5.4 CELIT will have completed their master plans by December 15, 1977.

5.5 CELIT will implement the master plan at the beginning of the spring semester 1978.

5.6 Evaluation of the implementation of the CELIT master plan will be completed by June 30, 1978.

Activities Accomplished

ACTIVITIES ACCOMPLISHED

In order to better address the purpose of the project and thus meet its goals, specific objectives were systematically addressed during the two distinct phases of the project; that is, the planning phase and the implementation phase. The former phase occurred during the Fall semester, while the latter occurred during the Spring semester. Furthermore, since the midyear report addressed the outcomes effected by the planning phase, this final report will primarily focus on the outcomes from the implementation phase. It should be kept in mind that a true bifurcation of activities is not possible as both planning and implementation activities took place throughout the total project period.

Also, it should be noted that this method of organization will obviously influence unevenly the reporting of outcomes. This is due to the fact that the midyear report documented LoU outcomes reflecting planning. This included the categorical objectives of knowledge, acquiring information, and planning. On the other hand, this final report addresses the implementation phase and, therefore, will show more activity in the LoU categories of performing, assessing, and status reporting.

The following is a compilation of major activities which occurred during the implementation phase of the project. They are listed by first restating the learner outcome or performance objective, then by stating the activities which were engaged in to meet the specific objective.

2.1a All career education leadership interaction team members will increase their level of knowledge of career education.

Members of the teams increased their knowledge of career education through their personal involvement in plan implementation. Team members also continued to gain knowledge of career education through project newsletters and correspondence. Several team plans created the need for inquiries and information gathering.

These activities influenced the corresponding knowledge of career education. Monthly local team meetings and occasional contacts with the State Department of Education also played a role in knowledge increase for CELIT members.

2.1b All CELIT members will increase their level of acquiring career education information.

Several facets of team plans such as the establishment of local Advisory Committees and the compilation of a directory of resources involved team members in information-acquiring activities. Such contacts brought team members in touch with other community members in order to acquire information about their jobs, their personal schedules and their willingness to cooperate with the schools. Team members also were involved in acquiring information about various aspects of their local program from the State Department of Education. A great deal of information was acquired in library building and in building reference files. Also, information about assessment and evaluation was acquired in the process of choosing the evaluation instruments used in plan implementation.

2.1c All CELIT members will increase their level of planning career education activities.

This report covers the implementation phase of project CELIT; the planning phase having been accomplished earlier. However, the formalizing of the phases for the purpose of organizing activities and conceptualizing the project does not preclude their overlap. Hence, some planning continued into the implementation phase. Team members learned to interact with a formal written plan. They experienced the refinement and adjustment aspects of planning. Also, they learned to plan their personal and committee schedules to act out a

time line. Periodic team meetings served as opportunities to report progress to fellow team members and to alter plans and time lines to account for unexpected events.

2.2a All CELIT members will increase their level of sharing career education ideas, concepts, plans, etc.

Sharing information on individual aspects of the overall project was a regular activity in implementation. Since the total task of implementation was sub-divided into sub-committees and individual tasks the main avenue of keeping informed of the overall program was sharing. This activity was carried out both formally in the meetings and informally. Information-seeking activities, such as recruiting Advisory Committees, compiling resource directories, and acquiring printed materials necessitated persuading persons who were unaware of career education as a concept. Team members shared knowledge and enthusiasm in order to be successful in these activities. Several team members had the opportunity to share by making presentations on team activities before organized groups, such as the PTA and civic clubs.

2.2b All CELIT members will increase their level of performing career education activities.

Performing was by definition the major activity of the implementation phase of the project. A broad variety of activities were performed in order to achieve plan objectives. Teams were organized into sub-committees and work assigned on an equal basis. A sample of the activities performed is testing students, writing infusion materials, infusion, in-service training for colleagues, recruiting community support (Advisory Committees and resource persons), informing administration, informing the public through various media,

acquiring printed material, mail and telephone inquiries, and meeting attendance.

2.3a All CELIT members will increase their level of status reporting of their involvement with career education.

Status reporting by CELIT members increased formally and informally. Formal reporting was necessary in order to keep the administration, the School Board, fellow faculty and team members informed as to progress. Other interested persons and contacts were brought up-to-date on an informal basis. Several team members were interviewed and gave status reports to the public via radio and newspapers.

2.3b All CELIT members will increase their level of assessing career education activities.

The team members increased their level of assessing in this implementation phase of the project. A baseline was established for most objectives. In some cases this was done by direct observation and in others an instrument of measurement was used. Outcomes were also measured at the end of the implementation phase in most cases.

Project Wide Activities

The following activities were conducted by the CELIT staff in meeting the "Pre-training Objectives," and in actualizing the proposed "Activities for Meeting the Objectives," and the "Seminar Activities," as outlined on pages 9 through 19 of this report.

Project coordinators attended a one-day planning meeting in Little Rock prior to the official notification of the grant award. This meeting was held to enable the coordinators from each university to finalize plans for local school/community site selection and to review procedures for selecting CELIT team members. Site selection criteria was based on size, geographical, and socioeconomic considerations, willingness to participate, and existing resources within the school.

Each sponsoring university worked with one large (K-12 enrollment of 1500 or more students) school district/community and one small (K-12 enrollment of 750 or fewer students) school district/community. Target schools were to provide the broadest possible geographical and socioeconomic representation. Additionally those schools which had existing resource persons were given special consideration. Willingness to participate was essential.

On August 14 and 15, graduate assistants and coordinators from all universities attended a two-day workshop at Southern Arkansas University. The workshop was conducted by Dr. Elizabeth Shipman and was designed to train graduate assistants in interviewing procedures for pre-testing team members.

Following completion of pre-testing, each university scheduled a two-day workshop for CELIT teams. The workshops focused on training in Career Education concepts and the community as a resource. Each team selected weekly meeting times and locations for planning session seminars. Weekly planning session seminars were conducted by teams and university coordinators.

Highlights of the seminar sessions were visits by Emil Mackey and Guy'lene Dwyer from the Career Education Office in the Arkansas State Department of Education. Loretto Bonner visited team seminar meetings to discuss her experiences involving the Russellville, Arkansas, industrial community in career education. Her visits were most effective and resulted in some revised planning by teams.

A second coordinators' meeting was held in Little Rock on October 13 to review progress and to review reporting procedures and plans for gathering information on project activities.

A state-wide meeting of team members was held on the University of Arkansas at Little Rock campus on November 5. This meeting of team members from all local sites was requested by team members for the purpose of sharing ideas between teams. All ten teams were well represented with more than half sending multiple representatives. This meeting was only partially funded by project

funds. Many team members attended at their own or their work station's expense. Sue Warmath and Bill Lewis discussed strategies and outcomes from programs which used industrial personnel to teach educators about the world of industry.

On November 11, the Project Director and Project Coordinator attended the Project Directors' meeting sponsored by the U. S. Office of Career Education.

On January 5 and 6, David Lusk, third party evaluator, visited the project office. He reviewed weekly reports, team plans, process, and outcome objectives, and made appropriate recommendations.

Project staff compiled the mid-year report submitted to the U. S. Office of Career Education. The purpose of the report was to review progress of the project.

Don Rye attended a Project Directors' meeting in Atlanta sponsored by the U. S. Office of Career Education on May 24 and 25.

Post-test evaluation was conducted by each university to assess effectiveness of the project.

The final report was prepared and submitted to the U. S. Office of Education.

Site Activities - Common

In implementing the project, all sites carried out common as well as site-specific activities. Following is a list of those activities performed by all sites.

Initially volunteers for all teams were recruited with an attempt to include school, community, and business representation. School administrators were contacted and their cooperation solicited.

Team members were selected and all teams carried out career education orientation and training sessions.

All teams held weekly planning seminars during the first six months. These sessions resulted in the development of a workable plan to be followed during the second six months of the project.

Each team sent representatives to a state-wide meeting in Little Rock. Participants were instructed on how to develop collaborative efforts between school and industry.

During the plan development stage each university assisted teams by providing resource materials, e.g. slide tapes on career education, written materials, etc.

As required by the proposal, each team developed its own plan and implemented that plan during the second half of the fiscal year. Each team-

-developed a needs assessment survey

-infused career education in classrooms

-developed a resource directory

-formed an advisory committee to maintain efforts in career education once the CELIT project was completed

Site Activities - Specific

In addition to the common activities carried out by all sites, there were site-specific activities that should be shared. Listed by coordinating university, the following is a partial list of such activities.

University of Central Arkansas:

The UCA team compiled a directory of current career education practitioners in the State of Arkansas. The directory was distributed at the state-wide conference on career education in July.

Lavern Kuen presented a seminar to the Vilonia team on infusion.

The Vilonia team implemented an Experience-Based Career Education program at their local high school. Ten high school seniors spent one day a week at various business sites learning the "ins" and "outs" of the occupations.

University of Arkansas:

The Siloam Springs team conducted in-service on-the-site training for teachers. Once a week, tours at local businesses were conducted for the teachers to enable them to better understand the world of work.

Southern Arkansas University:

Guy'lene Dwyer spoke to the SAU teams on available funding for career education and how to obtain funds.

A presentation on the National Career Education Conference held in Houston, Texas was given by Loretto Bonner. Her topic was, "What's Happening in Career Education."

Henderson State University:

Paul Batson wrote a series of articles on career education for the Daily Sifting Herald, the local newspaper. These articles contained information on what career education means and why it is important, as well as what efforts were being made in their community.

Two of the Magnet Cove team members visited an exemplary career education program in Ogden, Utah. There they learned how to best implement "shadowing," a program placing students at business sites for observation.

After returning from Utah, the Magnet Cove team implemented shadowing in the Magnet Cove High School.

Arkansas State University:

After designing their team plans, members of the Paragould team presented a program to the Paragould Kiwanis Club on how they planned to implement career education in their community.

DISSEMINATION

In keeping within the guidelines provided by USOE for project performance reports as outlined by OE Form 467, 2/76, this report now turns to activities directed toward efforts to disseminate information about the project and to special activities conducted during the project.

In reviewing the dissemination efforts conducted, it can readily be seen that those efforts naturally separate into two major areas. First, each site was actively engaged in communicating their efforts to their own communities and to the surrounding areas. Second, the project director was involved in communicating the project activities throughout the State of Arkansas as well as communicating those activities on a national level. Some of the activities were:

A. The individual sites accepted the responsibility of disseminating CELIT information to the broader communities in which they were involved. Their specific activities included such things as local newspaper articles concerning the project, radio and television presentations about career education and project CELIT, and civic club presentations by CELIT members. Furthermore, the weekly meetings served as a dissemination method for materials relevant to career education. Also used were special workshops to familiarize entire participating school system faculties to career education and the CELIT model. Resource directories and resource files were developed for use by faculties of participating school systems.

   Site-specific activities included the following:

   Arkansas State University presented a five-minute radio program on CELIT. The Monnette team gave presentations to the Lions Club and Alpha Delta Kappa. At Paragould, presentations on Career Education were given to four P.T.A. groups, one service group, and one teacher's sorority group. In addition, a community survey appeared in the local newspaper.

Henderson State University submitted weekly coordinator's reports. The local newspaper, Daily Sifting Herald, published a series of articles on Career Education and CELIT. A picture accompanied an article in the Reynolds Plant Billet.

At Southern Arkansas University, Dr. Paul Kirkpatrick presented the project to Dr. Frank Irwin's Graduate Secondary Curriculum class. The CELIT Newsletter circulated among team members and Education Staff at SAU. Dr. Shipman presented the CELIT project at Camden to the Regional Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development. The students at Camden and Harmony Grove developed a radio program. The format of the program included interviewing community resource people.

At the University of Central Arkansas, the CELIT Newsletter circulated among the faculty and staff. Dr. Kenneth Coon presented an introduction and short project program to the faculty. He also spoke to the Morrilton Rotary and appeared on a monthly statewide program sponsored by the P.T.A. on educational issues. This program was televised on January 12, 1978, over the five stations of the Arkansas Educational Television Network and the Public Broadcasting System (PBS) channel. As a guest of the Arkansas P.T.A. President, Mrs. Bonnie Lewis of Camden, Dr. Coon presented a general overview description of the project on this televised program. In addition, articles on Career Education appeared in the UCA and area newspapers. Morrilton had three articles in the local newspaper. Their project chairman spoke to the school board and to classes at UCA. The Vilonia team had two articles in the Conway newspaper and one article in the State Department Publication. The project chairman spoke to the school board. In an Experience-Based Career Education (EBCE) program, post-essays written by students were filed in the library with other Career Education materials.

B. The dissemination activities from the project director's office centered around a bi-monthly CELIT Newsletter, an "in house" weekly newsletter, the distribution of CELIT abstracts, and several presentations, both formal and informal. In addition, a Mailing List and Resource Directory were developed.

Specifically, the CELIT Newsletter was distributed to all Arkansas school superintendents, all Arkansas counselors, and to all Arkansas vo-tech school directors. Out-of-state distribution included all 1977-78 OCE funded projects as well as all State Directors of Career Education. The newsletter was also made available to all education faculty in the five participating universities. Total dissemination was 2500 per issue.

The project's "in house" newsletter was a compilation of coordinator's reports about weekly site activities. It was distributed internally to help expedite communications during the project.

A comprehensive slide-tape presentation outlining the CELIT model was produced and made available. The sponsoring universities, the State Department of Education, the State Supervisor of Counseling and Guidance, the State Supervisor of Career Education, and the United States Office of Career Education have received copies. The universities will be presenting the slide-tape in classes on Career Education.

A statewide conference on Career Education is scheduled for July 31 and August 1, 1978. CELIT, as co-sponsor, will present two mini-conference sessions entitled, "How to Succeed in Collaboration by Really Trying: Project CELIT."

An Arkansas Educational Television Network program, "Learning and Living Series," will be aired on November 13, 1978. The program will involve a panel discussion of Project CELIT and Career Education in Arkansas. Panel members include Dr. Don Rye, Dr. Kenneth Coon, Dr. Claude Caffee, and

Special Activities

Larry Baker. The program will be televised over the five stations of the Arkansas Educational Television Network and the Public Broadcasting System (PBS) channel.

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

As with dissemination efforts, special activities, including efforts to reduce race and sex stereotyping in career choice and efforts to provide career education for handicapped people, can be divided into two major areas. First, each site conducted special activities. Second, the office of the project director conducted special activities. Some of the activities were:

A. Team members discussed the need to avoid sex and race stereotyping in presenting career options to the students. They included appropriate materials in their clusters and plans for presentation to students. A workshop on sex stereotyping was held, and efforts to provide career education for the handicapped were developed. Resource speakers included representative workers in the community who have overcome some of the above obstacles to become successful persons in their respective fields. Team and Advisory Council members were balanced in terms of race, sex, and handicapped representation. Materials in the Career Education projects were approved and screened to eliminate the above biases. Safety town and other field trips were scheduled which included the handicapped obstacle course for awareness of problems of the handicapped. Site-specific activities included the following:
At Monnette and Paragould, a sex role stereotyping seminar was held.
A community survey appeared in the local newspaper at Paragould.
Henderson State University plans to offer a course on Career Education for Exceptional Students which will include the learning disabled, the gifted, and the talented. At a weekly team meeting of the Hot Springs

CELIT, members heard presentations by Joe Smith on the Gifted Program, and by Dianne White on Special Education Activities. Two Magnet Cove members visited an exemplary Career Education program in Utah to gain insight as to "how to best implement shadowing." Magnet Cove also implemented an extensive work-study program and held an In-Service Day.

Sponsored by Southern Arkansas University, the Camden team participated in the Youth Employment Demonstration Act. At Harmony Grove, teachers and counselors were in-serviced and provided with Career Education packets, CELIT plans, and assigned clusters for each subject area as well as occupation awareness categories for each level and grade level. In addition, Harmony Grove submitted a mini-grant proposal to the State Office of Career Education to support school/community based Career Education plans. They set up three project committees: (1) to develop an advisory committee and select committee members; (2) to send questionnaires to prospective community resource persons; and (3) to work on existing programs.

At the University of Central Arkansas, the project coordinator attended the "Better Project Management" Seminar in Washington. The Vilonia team included in their plan an EBCE (Experience Based Career Education) pilot program. This involved letting twelve seniors spend one day per week working on a job instead of attending classes. Special efforts were made to balance the team with an equal number of boys and girls. Efforts were also made to allow the girls to experience non-traditional jobs when they desired. Post-essays written by students were filed in the library with other Career Education materials.

B. Efforts from the office of the project director included several special activities. On November 5 and 6, 1977, a special meeting of all team members and all project staff was held at the University of Arkansas at

Little Rock campus. This meeting was arranged at the request of various team members who wished to have an opportunity to share ideas with team members from other project sites. A special feature of this meeting was a visit by two persons who discussed the "Educators in Industry" program being conducted in Kentucky by General Electric and Murray State University.

On December 1, 1977, the project director, the coordinator, and the administrative assistant met in Little Rock with the State Supervisor of Career Education and his staff. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the guidelines for future Career Education mini-grants to be administered by the state.

During April, 1978, all CELIT university coordinators and the CELIT administrative assistant attended a three-day workshop jointly sponsored by the State Department of Education Offices of Counseling and Guidance and Career Education, and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. This workshop was designed to familiarize the workshop participants in the "Rural America Series," a comprehensive Career Guidance, Counseling, Placement, and Follow-through Program (K-14) for rural schools. Each CELIT school system has received a copy of the "Rural America Series" for their own use.

Two CELIT staff members attended a national "Born Free" workshop on sex-role stereotyping in education. This week-long workshop was sponsored by the University of Minnesota in conjunction with a two-year grant from the Women's Educational Equity Act Program. Project "Born Free" materials are currently being institutionalized in CELIT activities.

On June 8, 9, and 10, 1978, a meeting of project staff was held at DeGray Lodge near Arkadelphia. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the final evaluation, the final report, and to share the subjective perceptions of the staff regarding the project's success. A special feature was

Evaluation

a discussion with selected state leaders on the question, "How can CELIT's results be used to further Career Education in Arkansas?"

A comprehensive slide-tape presentation outlining the CELIT model was produced and made available. The sponsoring universities, the State Department of Education, the State Supervisor of Counseling and Guidance, the State Supervisor of Career Education, and the United States Office of Career Education have received copies. The universities will be presenting the slide-tape in classes on Career Education.

A comprehensive CELIT Directory was developed. The purpose was to allow team members to contact other team members around the state.

A Graduate Level course titled, "Coordinating Career Education" has been developed from the CELIT model. It has been approved for the Spring semester of 1979 by the University of Arkansas Graduate Faculty Committee. The course will be offered to Master's level students in Counseling, Teaching, and Administration. (See Appendix D)

A broadly based Action Committee of persons representing Business, Labor, Industry, and Education (teachers, counselors, and administrators) organized to plan, coordinate, and help conduct the statewide conference on Career Education. The conference was held on July 31 and August 1, 1978, in Hot Springs, Arkansas. Project CELIT staff members served on this committee.

EVALUATION

This report, thus far, has documented the activities enacted in meeting the primary objectives of the project. Furthermore, the basic assumptions of the project have been delineated and the various steps needed to successfully replicate the CELIT model have been outlined. Hopefully, the information contained herein is sufficient to enable the interested reader in establishing a CELIT program in their own community.

The question remaining about the CELIT project is "was is effective?" This question can best be answered by reviewing the evaluation process and its results.

The adoption and implementation of any educational innovation is a change process, and that change is continuous. Furthermore, from the introduction of the concept of developing a program to the process of decision for adoption and implementing a program, the participants exhibit observably different types of behavior and patterns of innovation use. Individuals and groups move from distinct states of little or no knowledge, discussion, planning, or utilization of the innovation program to more complex states of knowledge, communication, and discernible action.

Project CELIT was an innovation involving persons in this type of change process. To evaluate the effectiveness of the CELIT model and to measure the extent to which behavior changes occurred, it is necessary to measure the CELIT members' level of knowledge of career education; their level of acquiring information about the program; their level of sharing, discussing and collaborating; their level of assessing their own progress; their level of planning, organizing, and coordinating and innovation; their personal stand and affective commitment to the project; and their level of performance in actually carrying out the individual project plans.

Measurement procedures for assessing what is actually accomplished by an innovation are easily obscured by defective, subjective assessment; therefore, it was proposed that evaluation of Project CELIT focus on what the individual innovation users were actually doing and at what level the team members were actually functioning.

Based on experiences in the field and past research and project efforts, it was found that change does not occur, and innovation adoption and implementation are not accomplished just because a decision maker or groups of decision makers

have announced it. Individual members, such as teachers, administrators, counselors, community members, etc., demonstrate a wide variation in the type and degree of innovation use.

One of the reasons for this variation is commonly overlooked. Innovation adoption and use is a process or series of decision points, not a single decision point. Outside variables, such as organizational climate, intervention strategies, and characteristics of the individual team members need to be considered. To actually account for what happens in an individual or team application of an innovation, it is necessary to identify the individual's level of use of that innovation. The levels of use can be determined by identifying behaviors through stages. From spending efforts in orienting, to managing, and finally to integrating use of the innovation before actual use, the individual becomes familiar with and increasingly knowledgeable about the innovation. First use is typically disjointed, with management problems quite common. With continued use, management becomes routine; and the individual user is able to direct more efforts toward increased effectiveness. The learner integrates what he/she is doing with what others are doing to form a collaborative effort. These advanced levels are obviously not attained merely by use of the innovation or merely from the passage of time. Experience is essential but not sufficient to insure that a given individual or team will develop high quality use of an innovation. The objectives of this project were to facilitate the movement of the team and individuals to higher levels of use of a career education program. The effectiveness of this project was determined by measuring the levels of use of team members and individual users before and after intervention activities. The extent to which the objectives of this project were accomplished can be determined by reporting the amount of discrepancy observed for individual levels of use, on both community based operation and on the seven categories of use. The evaluation design and methodology is contained in Appendix A.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The LoU scores for each member were analyzed first by visual inspection, second by sampling to arrive at the interrater reliability measure, third by percent of attainment, fourth by a statistical analysis using the "Student's t" test for independent means, and lastly by multiple linear regression.

The statistical procedures used to complete this evaluation consisted of a Chi^2 test for interrater reliability, the computation of a non-directional test of significance, and multiple linear regression. All data were compiled on summary rating sheets and then punched on IBM cards. A standard computer program was selected from the Southern Arkansas University Computer Library, TTST. The regression program was written by Dr. James Bolding, College of Education, University of Arkansas.

Visual Inspection:

Comparative pre-post summary sheets were prepared for each school in the CELIT Project. The following is a descriptive analysis of this summary data. (Also see Appendix A)

Morrilton: Team members at Morrilton moved from an overall LoU of 0 on the pre-test to LoU IV A on the post-test. The smallest gains were in the categories of Knowledge, Assessing and Planning. All other categories received LoU IV A levels.

Vilonia: Team members at Vilonia moved from an overall LoU of I on the pre-test to LoU IV A on the post-test. The smallest gain was in the category of Knowledge. The largest gains were in Acquiring Information, Assessing and Planning.

Comparison of Vilonia and Morrilton

Over all, Morrilton progressed more rapidly than Vilonia except in Acquiring Information, Assessing, and Planning. In all three of these categories Vilonia received a IV B rating. Morrilton began with 0 pre-test and ended with a IV A post-test

rating, indicating that Morrilton made the best overall progress.

Paragould: Team members moved from an overall LoU of 0 on the pre-test to LoU III on the post-test. There were no significant differences between gain scores, as all categories received a LoU III level.

Monette: Team members moved from an overall LoU of I on the pre-test to LoU III on the post-test. There were no significant differences between gain scores, as all categories received a LoU III level.

Comparison of Monette and Paragould

Monette and Paragould both moved from LoU 0 level in the pre-test to LoU III level on the post-test.

Gentry: Team members moved from an overall LoU 0 on the pre-test to an overall LoU of III on the post-test. The smallest gains were in the categories of Assessing and Status Reporting, moving from LoU I on the pre-test to LoU III on the post-test. The largest gain was in acquiring information, moving from LoU 0 on the pre-test to LoU IV on the post-test.

Siloam Springs: Team members moved from an overall LoU of 0 on the pre-test to an overall LoU of IV A on the post-test. Siloam Springs improved in every category from 0 level to IV A level.

Comparison of Siloam Springs and Gentry

Siloam Springs showed more improvement in each category than Gentry except in category "Acquiring Information." For this category they were rated the same.

Hot Springs: Team members moved from LoU of I on the pre-test to LoU of IV A on the post-test. They moved from a LoU of I to a LoU of IV B in the categories of Knowledge, Assessing, Planning, and Status Reporting. The smallest gains were seen in Acquiring Information, Sharing, and Performing.

Magnet Cove: Team members moved from LoU of I on the pre-test to LoU of V on the post-test. The largest gain was made in the category of Sharing, moving from a level of LoU of 0 on the pre-test to a LoU of V on the post-test. The smallest

gain was seen in the category of Status Reporting, moving from a LoU of II on the pre-test to a LoU of IV A on the post-test.

Comparison of Hot Springs and Magnet Cove

Magnet Cove team members moved from an overall LoU of I on the pre-test to an overall LoU of V on the post-test, while Hot Springs moved only from a LoU of I on the pre-test to a LoU of IV A on the post-test. The largest difference was seen in the category of Status Reporting with Hot Springs moving from I to IV B and Magnet Cove moving from II to IV A.

Camden: Team members moved from an overall LoU of I on the pre-test to an overall LoU of III on the post-test. There was a regression in the category of Acquiring Information. The largest gains were in the categories of Planning, Status Reporting, and Performing.

Harmony Grove: Team members moved from an overall LoU of II on the pre-test to an overall LoU of IV B on the post-test. The largest gains were in the categories of Planning and Sharing, moving from an LoU of I to an LoU of V. The smallest gain was in the category of Status Reporting, moving from an LoU of III to an LoU of IV B.

Comparison of Camden and Harmony Grove

The greatest difference of the two was in the category of Sharing with Harmony Grove moving from I to V, while Camden moved from 0 to I.

Interrater Reliability Estimate

A random sampling (using a table of random digits) of Level of Use Rating Sheets and Interview Tapes was made for estimating interrater reliability. The Chi^2 test for average of percent agreement was calculated using the formula:

$$Chi^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

There was no significant difference observed on the tapes by the raters. The agreement between these raters and other raters was reported to be 98.7 percent.

Percent Report

Each of the seven performance objectives outlined in this project identified all CELIT members as the learners to attain the stated level of proficiency. The percent of team members throughout the project actually reaching the proposed level of proficiency was 83. For a further breakdown of percentages, see Table 1. The results of the evaluation process reveal the fact that only one CELIT attained the stated level of proficiency at the 100 percent participation level. However, three CELIT's were found to have performed at better than the 90 percent level, with another four CELIT's functioning at the 80 percent level or better. This resulted in a project effectiveness of 83 percent. That is, 83 percent of all project participants attained a "use" level for each of the seven learner outcome categories.

It should be pointed out that many of the CELIT members' levels of use far exceeded the proficiency level established as the criterion of success for the project. In fact, 60 percent of the project participants exceeded the goal 'use level' with half of that group functioning at a use level it was hoped they would attain only after several years of involvement.

Statistical Analysis Using 't' tests

A statistical analysis using the "student's t" test for independent means was used. All schools showed significant gains in overall LoU scores at some level but only significant values beyond the .01 and .001 level are considered in the evaluation report. Therefore, only the Gentry LoU's do not show significant gains in the CELIT program for overall levels of use of career education. Camden schools showed a regression in one category of the LoU. However, their overall LoU gains were significant.

TABLE 1

A COMPARISON OF EACH CELIT'S

PRE-TEST/POST-TEST RESULTS

FOR EACH SPECIFIC

LEARNER OUTCOME CATEGORY

CELIT LOCATION	CAMDEN		GENTRY		HARMONY GROVE		HOT SPRINGS		MAGNET COVE		MONETTE		MORRILTON		PARAGOULD		SILOAM SPRINGS		VILONIA	
TESTING SESSION	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST
KNOWLEDGE	0	I	0	III	II	IVB	I	IVB	II	V	0	III	0	III	0	III	0	IVA	I	III
ACQUIRING INFORMATION	I	0	0	IVA	II	IVB	II	IVB	II	V	0	III	0	IVA	0	III	0	IVA	0	IVB
SHARING	0	I	I	IVA	I	V	I	IVA	0	V	0	III	0	IVA	0	III	0	IVA	I	IVA
ASSESSING	0	I	I	III	II	IVB	I	IVB	II	V	0	III	0	III	0	III	0	IVA	I	IVB
PLANNING	0	III	I	IVA	I	V	I	IVB	II	V	0	III	0	III	0	III	0	IVA	I	IVB
STATUS REPORTING	0	III	I	III	III	IVB	I	IVB	II	IVA	0	III	0	IVA	0	III	0	IVA	I	IVA
PERFORMING	0	III	0	III	II	IVB	I	IVA	I	V	0	III	0	IVA	0	III	0	IVA	I	IVA

TABLE 2

PERCENT OF CELIT MEMBERS AT EACH LOCATION

REACHING A "USE" LEVEL IN

A SPECIFIED LEARNER OUTCOME CATEGORY

CELIT LOCATION	CAMDEN	GENTRY	HARMONY GROVE	HOT SPRINGS	MAGNET COVE	MONETTE	MORRIL-TON	PARA-GOULD	SILOAM SPRINGS	VILONIA	AVERAGE
KNOWLEDGE	44%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	100%	83%	90%
ACQUIRING INFORMATION	33%	50%	91%	100%	92%	56%	73%	83%	70%	83%	77%
SHARING	33%	50%	91%	100%	100%	78%	82%	83%	100%	83%	83%
ASSESSING	22%	75%	91%	100%	100%	67%	100%	75%	100%	83%	83%
PLANNING	56%	75%	91%	100%	100%	89%	100%	75%	70%	83%	85%
STATUS REPORTING	22%	75%	91%	100%	100%	89%	100%	83%	90%	83%	85%
PERFORMING	44%	75%	91%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%	90%	83%	89%
TEAM AVERAGE	37%	67%	92%	100%	99%	86%	95%	80%	86%	83%	83%

PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS 83%

All schools moved from entry level LoU scores to at least level III LoU scores. The alpha level of significance for non-directional tests is in conjunction with the null hypothesis of "no significant difference: as a result of 'treatment' " (involvement in the CELIT project). The CELIT program can be considered effective in raising the levels of use of career education of the CELIT team members.

T tests for Morrilton team members were NOP=3; T=14.36 and NOP=4; T=9.03 . With 24 degrees of freedom, the t value of 3.745 = .001 alpha level of significance for non-directional tests. Therefore, it is concluded that both t values are significant at the .001 level.

T tests for Vilonia team members were NOP=3; T=7.90 and NOP=4; T=9.03 . With 24 degrees of freedom, the t value of 3.745 = .001 alpha level of significance for the non-directional tests. Therefore, it is concluded that both t values are significant at the .001 level.

T tests for Monette team members were NOP=3; T=4.6 and NOP=4; T=5.02 with 24 degrees of freedom, the t value 3.745 = .001 alpha level of significance for non-directional tests. Therefore, it is concluded that both t values are significant at the .001 level.

T tests for Paragould team members were NOP=3; T=9.53 and NOP=4; T=9.53 with 22 degrees of freedom, the t value 3.792 = .001 alpha level of significance for non-directional tests. Therefore, it is concluded that both t values are significant at the .001 level.

Statistical Analysis Using Multiple Regression

For this analysis, a backward multiple regression model was employed. This method was run twice, first with the post-test scores serving as the criterion variable and second with the gain scores serving as the criterion variable. The results are presented in Tables 3 through 6.

Table 3 presents the total percent of variance accounted for when using "pre-test," "university," and "site" as the individual predictors. The results of this

TABLE 3

MULTIPLE CORRELATION AND REGRESSION RESULTS
USING POST-TEST AS THE CRITERION VARIABLE
AND PRE-TEST, UNIVERSITY, AND SITE AS THE PREDICTORS
(THE RESULTS ARE REPORTED IN R SQUARE)

	Variance due to Pre-Test	Variance due to University	Variance due to Site	Total Variance Accounted for	r
KNOWLEDGE	.2946	.1062	.1813	.5821	.76
ACQUIRING INFORMATION	.0591	.3140	.2187	.5918	.77
PLANNING	.1569	.2125	.2787	.6481	.81
SHARING	.2455	.1667	.2917	.7039	.84
PERFORMING	.2367	.1358	.2254	.5980	.77
STATUS REPORTING	.1870	.1103	.1962	.4935	.70
EVALUATION	.2170	.1212	.2126	.5508	.74
COMPOSITE	.3275	.0749	.2203	.6228	.79

TABLE 4

MULTIPLE CORRELATION AND REGRESSION RESULTS
USING POST-TEST AS THE CRITERION VARIABLE
AND PRE-TEST, UNIVERSITY, AND SITE AS THE PREDICTORS
(THE RESULTS ARE REPORTED IN PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIANCE ACCOUNTED FOR)

	Variance due to Pre-Test	Variance due to University	Variance due to Site	Total Variance Accounted for
KNOWLEDGE	51%	18%	31%	100%
ACQUIRING INFORMATION	10%	53%	37%	100%
PLANNING	24%	33%	43%	100%
SHARING	35%	24%	41%	100%
PERFORMING	39%	23%	38%	100%
STATUS REPORTING	38%	22%	40%	100%
EVALUATION	39%	22%	39%	100%
COMPOSITE	53%	12%	35%	100%

TABLE 5

MULTIPLE CORRELATION AND REGRESSION RESULTS
USING GAIN SCORES AS THE CRITERION VARIABLE
AND PRE-TEST, UNIVERSITY, AND SITE AS THE PREDICTORS
(THE RESULTS ARE REPORTED IN R SQUARE)

	Variance due to Pre-Test	Variance due to University	Variance due to Site	Total Variance Accounted for	r
KNOWLEDGE	.0153	.1482	.2531	.4166	.65
ACQUIRING INFORMATION	.1271	.2913	.2029	.6213	.79
PLANNING	.0213	.2467	.3235	.5915	.77
SHARING	.0049	.2199	.3847	.6095	.78
PERFORMING	.0167	.1750	.2904	.4821	.69
STATUS REPORTING	.0558	.1281	.2279	.4118	.64
EVALUATION	.0222	.1513	.2655	.4390	.66
COMPOSITE	.0016	.1113	.3271	.4400	.66

TABLE 6

MULTIPLE CORRELATION AND REGRESSION RESULTS
USING GAIN SCORES AS THE CRITERION VARIABLE
AND PRE-TEST, UNIVERSITY, AND SITE AS THE PREDICTORS
(THE RESULTS ARE REPORTED IN PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIANCE ACCOUNTED FOR)

	Variance due to Pre-Test	Variance due to University	Variance due to Site	Total Variance Accounted for
KNOWLEDGE	4%	36%	60%	100%
ACQUIRING INFORMATION	20%	47%	33%	100%
PLANNING	4%	41%	55%	100%
SHARING	1%	36%	63%	100%
PERFORMING	3%	36%	61%	100%
STATUS REPORTING	14%	31%	55%	100%
EVALUATION	5%	34%	61%	100%
COMPOSITE	0%	25%	74%	100%

analysis show that the total percent of variance accounted for varies for the individual learner outcome categories. This variance ranges from a low of 49 percent under "status reporting" to a high of 70 percent under "sharing." The average amount of variance accounted for across the categories is 60 percent. The corresponding r is .77 .

Reported in Table 4 under each predictor is the percent of the total variance accounted for by that predictor. A brief review of those figures reveals a general trend across most categories. The greatest predictor of post-test results is "site." It is followed closely by pre-test, with university playing a lesser role in all instances except in the case of acquiring information. One other exception to the general trend is in the category of knowledge. For this category pre-test score is the best predictor of performance for the post-test.

Table 5 shows the total percent of variance accounted for by the three predictors "pre-test," "university," and "site" when gain score is used as the criterion variable. This percent of variance accounted for ranges from a low of 41 percent for categories knowledge and performance to 62 percent for the category acquiring information. When considering all learner outcome categories, the average amount of total variance accounted for is 51 percent. The corresponding r is .71 .

A further review of the various percents of the total variance accounted for in each category reveals the general trend that two predictors are of value in predicting gain scores. Again, in all cases except for the category acquiring information, "site" is the primary predictor. "University," as a predictor, is considerably less important than is "site" while "pre-test" is inconsequential as a predictor of gain scores.

The results of this analysis clearly indicate that "site" is the most important variable to consider in predicting an increase in performance across the various learner outcome categories. These results further support the basic assumptions

of the CELIT model, that local school/community leaders are the most important element in installing career education programs in a school system.

Summary of Self-Evaluation

In evaluating the CELIT Project objectives, the LoU Interview Technique was employed.

The evaluation of the LoU rating scales for each team member included a pre- and post-project measure. A discrepancy evaluation of the percentage provided direct evidence of project objectives as listed in the seven categories of the LoU. Figure 1.1 shows how each level and each category related to the appropriate project objectives. (See Appendix A). A difference between the Level of Use of an individual on a particular objective and category upon entry and upon completion of the CELIT project activities provided feedback as to the effectiveness of the model for that individual team member.

The data collected by the LoU techniques was also submitted to appropriate analysis of variance statistical methods tests to determine a significant difference between the level of use between pre- and post-groups and across the LoU categories. A significant difference indicated the effectiveness of the CELIT Project model activities and further corroborates the attainment of CELIT objectives.

The project evaluators were trained by August 19, 1978. The pre-test LoU interviews were completed for CELIT team members by September 30th. Post-test interviews were completed by May 20, 1978. Samples of rating scales and tapes were re-evaluated and established interrater reliability. The reliability was 98.7 percent. It was not surprising that schools not presently involved in Career Education Projects had very low levels of use while schools with past or on-going Career Education Projects exhibited higher levels of use.

It is the purpose of this evaluation to diminish the effects of previous experience in career education so that the LoU measure for the CELIT project can accurately measure the effects of this project and not the effects of previous experiences or knowledge of career education. For this reason the pre/post-test was adopted.

Conclusion

We feel confident that the effectiveness of each project objective has been adequately measured and reported.

CONCLUSION

Project CELIT was designed to demonstrate an effective method for training local community teams for installing collaborative interactions between the "world of school" and the "world of work." To accomplish this task, three project goals were identified. First, each team would be trained to develop a local community plan for installing collaborative career education activities; second, each team would be trained to implement a locally developed community career education plan; and third, each team would be trained to evaluate a CELIT implemented community career education plan.

The attainment of these individual goals can be attested to by the fact that all ten CELITs submitted a team plan which included timelines, procedures for the implementation of the plan, and an evaluation section designed to assess the accomplishments under specific plan objectives. Thus, each CELIT plan is a documentation of the effectiveness of the CELIT training process specifically in the areas of program development, program implementation, and program evaluation. Moreover, this method of documentation/evaluation, demonstrates the effectiveness of the experiential learning process as that process relates to educators and laypersons alike. It is a learning-by-doing approach that calls on skills from all participants.

In addition to the three goals identified for the project, seven performance or learner outcome objectives were developed to facilitate the accomplishment of the goals. These objectives directly correspond to the seven LoU categories of knowledge, sharing, acquiring information, assessing, planning, status reporting, and performing. The successful attainment of the performance objectives has been documented by the LoU evaluation process (see p. 32 of this report).

In looking at the average LoU pre-test results across any given category, the level of use identified is somewhere between the non-use level and the orientation-use level. This would be expected for school systems who have never engaged in formal career education activities. With the exceptions of three sites (Harmony Grove, Magnet Cove, and Hot Springs) this was generally the case. Furthermore, it would be expected that those school systems which pre-tested at a higher level of use would on the average move to the more advanced levels of use than would the school systems pre-testing at the lower levels of use. This follows from the fact that they are further along in their orientation process and, in some instances, their preparation for the use of career education practices. This expectation is supported by the LoU post-test results. Those results indicate that CELIT sites who pre-tested at the non-use level post-tested at the mechanical-use level while those CELIT sites which pre-tested at an orientation-use level post-tested at the mechanical-use or the routine-use levels. CELITs pre-testing at the orientation-use and preparation-use levels, for the most part, experienced the highest levels of use as measured by the post-test LoU process. They generally were found to be functioning at the refinement-use and integration-use levels.

In brief, it appears that those individuals post-testing at the higher levels of use are those who were more ready to use; that is, those who were functioning at the orientation-use level or the preparation-use level. More time is available for the interaction phases of the CELIT model as opposed to the information-giving phases. The participants are more ready to accept active roles and less passive roles. Therefore, from this review of the data, it appears that the CELIT model would work best in community/school systems which are somewhat aware of career education concepts but need some direction of formal leadership in getting started. This is not to rule out its effectiveness as an orientation

and preparation model for getting things started in community/school systems without a history of career education activities.

From this information, it can be concluded that the CELIT model is capable of being integrated into community/school systems and contributing to the growth of their programs regardless of the level of use at which those systems are functioning in reference to career education concepts and practices.

Furthermore, the LoU evaluation results strongly demonstrate the portability of the CELIT model across training institutions. This is substantiated by the results of the regression analysis. University, as a predictor for post-test results, is of less importance than is either pre-test or site. When considering university as a predictor of overall improvement, it again is less important than site. This supports the assumption that the CELIT model can be implemented by any institution for which there is a motivated site.

Also evidencing the mobility of the CELIT model is the fact that each of five Arkansas universities used the CELIT model in two community/school systems of different sizes--one large and one small. The pre/post LoU test results indicate that all CELIT site performances increased similar amounts regardless of the university doing the training. This similarity in CELIT performance is in lieu of the fact that each university coordinator conducted the workshop exercises and the seminar phase of the CELIT training from different group dynamic orientations. While the coordinators differed on their approach to training methodology, for the most part, the training materials available to the coordinators were the same. It should be pointed out, however, that no specific requirements for material use were established. Each coordinator was responsible for assessing the specific needs of their CELITs and to then address those needs.

Factors that should also be mentioned when considering the similarity between the various CELITs performance is the high level of communication between the

university coordinators and the sharing of materials and ideas. Throughout the year, statewide coordinator conferences were held for the purpose of bringing the coordinators together so they could actively share their project experiences. In addition to these periodic meetings, a weekly intra-project newsletter was developed and disseminated for the purpose of sharing successful activities (see Appendix C).

The results of the evaluation process definitely demonstrates the portability of the CELIT model, both from the producer/instructor's position and from that of the consumer/learner's.